DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 286 EC 309 212

AUTHOR	Jones, Jennifer; Adams, Gary; Schumaker, Jean B.; Deshler, Donald D.; Davis, Betsy; Grossen, Bonnie; Bulgren, Janis A.; Marquis, Janet; Lenz, B. Keith
TITLE	The Educational Context and Outcomes for High-School Students with Disabilities: The Perceptions of Administrators. Research Report.
INSTITUTION	Kansas Univ., Lawrence. Inst. for Academic Access.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	RR-6
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	31p.
CONTRACT	84.324S
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Accommodations (Disabilities); Administrator Role; *Disabilities; Educational Cooperation; Educational Planning; Educational Technology; High Schools; Inclusive Schools; *Outcomes of Education; *Professional Development; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Special Education; *Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

The sixth in a series of studies investigating the educational context and outcomes for high school students with disabilities (SWDs), this study compared views of general education and special education administrators on the educational programs for SWDs and other at-risk students. Administrators in three high schools in urban areas, three in suburban areas, and three in rural areas were interviewed. Results indicated that general and special education administrators did not seem to hold coordinated views. First, there was no coordinated vision on how SWDs should be educated. In fact, when asked, they indicated SWDs who were expected to receive a standard diploma should not be educated differently from other students. At least half of the administrators indicated there had been no staff development experiences focusing on students with disabilities. In addition, there seemed to be no coordinated plan for creating future staff development experiences for the teachers. Finally, there seemed to be no structures in place for formally evaluating special education programs and their outcomes. When asked about the use of technology for educating students with disabilities, the administrators indicated that standard computers and standard software were available. The protocol is attached. (Author/CR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Institute for Academic Access

Research Report #6

ED 469 286

The educational context and outcomes for high school students with disabilities: The perceptions of administrators

Jennifer Jones, Gary Adams, Jean B. Schumaker, Donald D. Deshler, Betsy Davis, Bonnie Grossen, Janis A. Bulgren, Janet Marquis, and B. Keith Lenz

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2002

EC 309212

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs Grant # 84.324S

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This descriptive study focused on a comparison of the views of general education administrators and special education administrators with regard to the educational programs for students with disabilities and other at-risk students in their high schools. Administrators in nine high schools participated. Three of the schools were located in urban areas; three were in suburban areas; and three were in rural areas. All of the administrators were interviewed using an interview protocol that contained 34 questions. Results indicated that general and special education administrators in the participating schools did not seem to hold coordinated views. First, there was no coordinated vision with regard to how these students should be educated. In fact, when asked, they all seemed to indicate that students with disabilities who were expected to receive a standard diploma should not be educated differently from other students. At least half of them indicated that there had been no staff development experiences in their schools focusing on these students. There seemed to be no coordinated plan with regard to creating future staff development experiences for the teachers. Additionally, there seemed to be no structures in place for formally evaluating special education programs and the outcomes of those programs. When asked about the use of technology for educating these populations, the administrators indicated that standard computers and standard software were available.

Ever since Americans were warned in 1983 through the landmark report *A Nation at Risk* about the status of our schools and the poor outcomes being produced, there has been a search for ways to reform and, in some cases, restructure schools. At the forefront of these discussions, attention has been directed to high schools to identify ways to improve how they can be configured to reach the increasingly diverse student bodies they are expected to serve. The mounting pressures for students to pass state achievement tests and to accommodate a student body that manifests significant learning, language, and social/behavioral challenges is an overwhelming assignment for all educators. Adequately meeting the needs of adolescents who are saddled with a disability makes the challenge before educators even more daunting.

Because of these pressures, general and special education administrators must work collaboratively to strengthen the special education service delivery system (Mongan & Demchak, 1998). Unfortunately, several surveys (e.g., Arick & Krug, 1993) suggest that this is not the case. Coleman (2000) found that special education teachers lacked planning time and had few opportunities to collaborate with other teachers. More specifically, in a survey of school superintendents, district-level special education administrators, and building principals, Sullivan (1996) found the least amount of congruence between special education administrators and building administrators. There was disagreement about the performance requirements of 19 of 40 tasks and the degree of importance of 17 of the 40 tasks.

The purpose of this study was to compare the level of agreement of responses between special education and general education administrators to questions in six areas of administration: Organization and Curriculum, Programs, Staff Development, Planning for Instruction, Program Evaluation, and Technology.

Method

Settings

Nine public high schools serving grades nine through twelve participated. Three types of high schools participated. Three of the high schools (hereafter referred to as "urban high schools") represented schools located in high-density areas (i.e., urban/metropolitan areas populated by more than 150,000 people) in which more than 50% of the student population is comprised of "students living in poverty." "Students living in poverty" were defined, for the purposes of this study, as students who had applied for and received free or reduced lunch privileges. Three of the high schools (hereafter referred to as "rural high schools") represented schools located in low-density population areas (i.e., towns of less than 10,000 people and less than 150 people per square mile) and in which more than 10% of the student population was comprised of students living in poverty. Three of the high schools (hereafter referred to as "suburban high schools") represented schools that were located in towns having a population of

more than 45,000 people and less than 150,000 people and in which less than 10% of the student population was comprised of students living in poverty.

Three of the high schools (one urban, one rural, and one suburban) were located in Kansas. Three of the high schools (one urban, one rural, and one suburban) were located in the state of Washington. Two schools (one rural, one urban) were located in California. One school (suburban) was located in Oregon.

The student populations in the urban schools ranged in size from 1,031 students to 3,508 students, while in the rural schools the populations ranged in size from 330 students to 693 students. The student populations in the suburban schools ranged in size from 931 students to 1,691 students.

The percentage of students with disabilities in the nine schools ranged from 3.9% in a suburban school to 14.8% in an urban school. Six of the schools had Caucasian majorities, ranging from 67% to 95% of the student population. One school had a Latino/Hispanic majority; one school had an African American majority; and one had an Armenian majority.

Participants

General Education Administrators. The principals in all 9 schools participated in this study. Demographic information was collected on 7 of the principals: 3 were males and 4 were females, all were white, 1 had a doctorate and the rest had Master's degrees, and 5 were certified of teach in their state. The average age of the principal was 48.6 years. The principals had an average of 5.9 years of experience as principals, had completed an average of 2 university special education classes and 32.8 hours of special education inservice experiences, and belonged to 2 professional organizations.

Special Education Administrators. An individual who had been designated as the person responsible for administering the special education program in the school and who had an office/classroom in the school participated as the special education administrator. Nine special education administrators participated. Demographic information was collected on 7 of these administrators: 6 were males and 1 was a female; 6 were white (1 Hispanic) and 1 was black; 1 had a doctorate and the rest had Master's degrees; and all 7 were certified of teach in their state. The average age of the special education administrator was 48.2 years. They had an average of 11.3 years of experience as administrators, had completed an average of 20 university special education classes and 20.1 hours of special education inservice, and belonged to 3.7 professional organizations.

Measurement

The **Administrator Information Form** was a survey instrument that contained 26 items. This form was designed to gather demographic and personal information about the

administrators such as their age, race, sex, years in the education profession, and educational history. Data collected through the use of this form is reported in the Subjects section above.

The **Administrator Interview Protocol** contained questions grouped in six sections. The purpose of the interview was to gather information from the administrators about the ways their schools were serving students with disabilities, providing professional development experiences with regard to serving students with disabilities, and their attitudes about serving students with disabilities. The questions related to the organization and curriculum of the school, programs that were currently serving students with disabilities, staff development experiences, planning with regard to ensuring students meet state standards, program evaluation activities, instructional and adaptive technology available to the students with disabilities, and the school budget as it related to serving students with disabilities and providing inservice programs for the staff.

Procedures

The first author interviewed each administrator in person or by telephone. Administrators were asked the questions on the Administrator Protocol. Each interview was audiotaped with the permission of the administrator, and each administer was asked the same questions. The information derived from these interviews was analyzed through the following transcript evaluation process:

- The audiotapes of the interviews were transcribed by the first author.
- The responses generated from the interviews were compiled through a sorting and grouping process. Each administrator's response was transferred to a 3" x 5" card. Each response was then grouped according to the question to which it corresponded and sorted into categories.
- Overall categories were developed for each question. The results of this process are shown in the Appendix.

Results

Appendix A provides a summary of responses to the questions in the administrator's survey. The results will be described according to sections of questions asked: Organization and Curriculum, Programs, Staff Development, Planning for Instruction, Program Evaluation, and Technology. The answers of special education and general education administrators for questions in each section will be compared and contrasted. While each of the 9 general education administrators (principals) and 9 special education administrators participated in the interviews, they did not necessarily answer all of the questions (in some instances, they felt they had responded to the question in a prior answer, in other instances, they offered no response, and, in two instances, the audiotape ran out unbeknownst to the researcher). Hence, some of the results will be presented with different numbers of administrators responding.

Organization and Curriculum

Special and general education administrators gave similar answers and have similar patterns of responding to Question 1 ("Does your school have a general mission statement? If so, what is it?"). For both types of administrators, the most common answer was "Commitment to education and life." Also, the majority of the (4 of 7) special education administrators and (5 of 7) general education administrators stated that there was no formal vision or policy statement on the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes (Question 2). The questions about the academic paths offered within the general curriculum resulted in very different responses from members of the two groups. Six of the 8 special education administrators who responded described the schools' academic paths as college preparation, while only 1 of the 8 general education administrators in the same schools described their schools as having a college preparation orientation. In contrast, 2 special education administrators and 7 general education administrators said that their school had multiple academic paths. It is unclear if there is a discrepancy in responses for Question 3 ("What is your school's procedures for assigning students with disabilities to general education classes?"). Three of 8 special education administrators and 7 of 8 general education administrators stated that the school's procedure for assigning students with disabilities to general education classrooms was "within the IEP process." Three additional special education administrators stated that the procedure was to "place students in general education courses as much as possible." This response may just be a more specific response within the framework on the "within the IEP process" answer.

There were major discrepancies in response patterns between 4 special education and 6 general education administrators to the questions about the challenges that at-risk students and students with disabilities face in succeeding the general education classes (Questions 4a and 4b). The only overlap with at least two similar responses was "staff training and the students' lack of time" for both types of students. In general, other challenges mentioned were usually single responses without overlap between the two types of administrators (see Appendix A). In responses to the following questions (Questions 5a and 5b), there was agreement about school discipline at their schools. Half of both sets of administrators stated that their school has a school-wide discipline plan that is specific to their school, which is described in their school's student handbook. There was close agreement that their school's school-wide discipline program was based on district policy in approximately one-third of the schools. Five of eight of each of the administrator groups stated that their school had effective discipline plans. Two of each group stated that their discipline plan was somewhat effective, and one administrator in each group stated that their plan was ineffective. There were only two responses to questions about changes that they would like to see happen to further ensure the success of students who are

either at-risk or students with disabilities in standard general education classes. Approximately one-half of each group of administrators stated that the need was staff development and the other half stated that a programming change was needed (Question 6a). When administrators were asked to respond about students with disabilities (Question 6b), five of eight administrators in each group stated that the most important issue was programming changes while 3 special education administrators and 2 general education administrators stated that staff development was the highest priority. The response pattern for Question 7 ("Do you see these two groups of students as being different in their needs") was interesting in that half of each group stated that the two types of students were similar, and half of each group stated that the two types of students were different.

There was considerable overlap between special and general administrators supervising at-risk students (Question 8a) and students with disabilities (Question 8b). While three of eight special education administrators stated that they spent zero time supervising at-risk students, 3 special education supervisors and 4 general education supervisors stated that they spent 1% to 10% of their time supervising at-risk students. Two of the special education supervisors and four of the general education supervisors reported that they spend 20-35% of their time supervising at-risk students. When the same question was asked about supervising students with disabilities, there was a shift at the extremes. Only one general education administrator stated that she spent zero percent time supervising students with disabilities, and three of the eight special education supervisors stated that they spent over 90% of their time supervising students with disabilities. Approximately two-thirds of both administrator groups spend similar percentages of time with both types of students, from 3% to 30% of their time.

Programs

Question 9 asked "How do you integrate dollars from multiple programs at your school to ensure the success of students with disabilities in rigorous general education classes?" While six of eight general education administrators stated that the funding was through various ways or stated that the funding was not integrated, more than half of the special education administrators were "not sure" or did not know.

There was considerable difference when the same question was asked about at-risk students versus students with disabilities. When asked "What programs does your school currently have in place to ensure the success of students who are at-risk who are enrolled in rigorous general education classes (those required for a standard diploma)?" (Question 10a), the pattern for both groups of administrators was similar, with most administrators stating that "special programs" were used. In contrast, while the responses of special education administrators are the same when the question was changed to students with disabilities (Question 10b), the responses shifted from mainly "special programs" to a range of low-

frequency responses. The other part of this question asked if their school had extended learning time (Question 10c). Almost all schools provided extended learning time (Question 10d).

There was a major difference in the pattern of responses to Question 11: "What components within those programs are most effective in promoting students' success?" Most of the general education administrators focused on teachers (5-caring teachers, 1-individualized attention, and 1-teacher support). In contrast, the 8 special education administrators who responded gave 5 different explanations; half of their responses did not involve teacher-related issues.

Special education administrators responded to "How does your school involve parents in helping students learn academic skills?" (Question 12) by usually citing their own ongoing communication efforts. One-fourth of the general education administrators mentioned less frequent parent contact.

Staff Development

Approximately, half of the special and general education administrators stated that teacher recommendations were the primary source for staff development planning and implementation (Question 13a: "How is staff development planned and implemented in your school/district?"). However, the other half of administrators provided a wide diversity of responses.

When asked about the staff development focusing on at-risk students (Question 13b: "How is staff development intentionally focused on improving the performance of at-risk students in rigorous general education classes?"), over half of the special education administrators stated that there was none or not much effort. Similarly, when the question was shifted to students with disabilities in Question 14 ("How is staff development intentionally focused on improving the performance of students with disabilities in rigorous general education classes?"), special education and general education administrators stated that there was none or not much effort.

Question 15 asked "What staff development activities in your school have been aimed at helping at-risk students meets state standards?" There was only a little overlap in answers, with 5 special education administrators giving 5 different answers. In contrast, when asked, "What staff development activities in your school have been aimed at helping special education students meet state standards?" (Question 16), special and general education administrators provided overlapping responses. Unfortunately, approximately one-half of both administrators stated that there were no staff development activities.

When asked "What staff development training methods or models are used in this school which promote positive outcomes in staff learning and positive changes in staff instructional behavior?" (Question 17), one-half of the special education administrators responded "None." In

contrast, general education administrators interpreted this question in a wide range of ways and gave very different responses.

Again, there was disagreement to the question of changing staff development (Question 18: "How would you like to change your current staff-development system?) between general and special education administrators. Three of the nine special education administrators stated that there needed to be more staff-development sessions whereas two said that there should be fewer staff development sessions.

When asked, "In the last two years, how many staff development sessions have you focused on at-risk students," 4 special education administrators and 2 general education administrators stated that there had been none. Similarly, the same pattern of the lack of staff development was mentioned about students with disabilities (Question 19b: "In the last two years, how many staff development sessions have you focused on students with disabilities?"). In this case, 5 special education administrators and 3 general education administrators said that there had been none.

Planning for Instruction

Special and general education administrators had similar definitions for standards-based instruction (Question 20a: "What is your definition of standards-based instruction?"): "identified critical skills" and "match instruction to benchmarks." Also, they had similar patterns of responses to the Question 20b "What advantages do you see in standards-based teaching?" Approximately two-thirds of each group gave "consistency" and "teachers know what to teach" responses. In contrast, there was considerable disparity when asked Question 20c, "What disadvantages do you see in standards-based teaching?" The same was true to Question 20d "What barriers do you see in standards-based teaching?"

When the questions shifted to the connections to state standards, there were some questions that yielded high agreement (e.g., Question 20a: "What is the definition of standards-based instruction? Answers: "identified critical skills" and "match instruction to benchmarks." Question 20b: What advantages do you see in standards-based teaching? Answers: "consistency" and "teachers know what to teach"). In contrast, there was a wide range of non-overlapping response to Question 20c ("What disadvantages do you see in standards-based teaching?") Again there was little overlap to Question 20d ("What barriers do you see in standards-based teaching?) with no comment receiving more than 2 responses.

While both sets of administrators stated that state standards should be used for curriculum to align curriculum to standards (Question 21a), only one-third of special education administrators answered the next two questions (Question 21b) "How are state standards used in your school for instruction?" and (Question 21c) "How are state standards used in your school for assessment?" About half of both groups stated that when asked (Question 21d) "How are

state standards used in your school for teacher evaluation?", state standards were not a part of teacher evaluation.

There was considerable lack of overlap in responses to Question 22a "How does standards-based teaching influence the education for at-risk students who are enrolled in standard general education classes?" Interestingly, one-third of the general education administrators said that standards-based teaching makes no difference in the education of at-risk student who are enrolled in standard general education classes. Attendance was the most frequent response for general and special education administrators as a barrier to helping at-risk students meet state standards (Question 22b). However, that response involved only 2 administrators in both groups, and there was little overlap in the other responses. Also, the most common response to Question 22c "How are at-risk students enrolled in standard general education courses educated differently than other general education students?" was that they shouldn't be treated differently.

Like the previous question, the most common response to the Question 23a "How does standards-based teaching influence the education of students with disabilities who are enrolled in standard general education classes?" was that it didn't make a difference. However, responses to the question "Other than time, what are the barriers to helping students with disabilities meet state standards?" (Question 23b) differed. The most frequent response for special education administrators was that they "needed trained staff" and the most frequent response for general education administrators was that they "lacked time to meet standards." Again, when asked "How should students with disabilities enrolled in standard general education courses be educated differently than other students who are at risk?" (Question 23c), the most common response for both types of administrator was that they shouldn't be treated differently.

With regard to planning, both types of administrators stated "the regular daily planning time" in response to the question, "What structures are in place in your school to allow general education teachers time to plan their instruction to align with state standards?" (Question 24), and to "What structures are in place in your school to allow special education and general education teachers time to plan instruction together?" (Question 25).

Program Evaluation

There was often little overlap in the responses to questions in this section about program evaluation. In response to the question, "What methods or procedures are used to evaluate education programs in your school?" (Question 26), approximately one-third of general and special education administrators mentioned yearly reports or long-term evaluation plans. The other responses did not overlap. Two-thirds of general administrators responded to the question "What are the outcomes for students with disabilities who are enrolled in standard general education courses?" (Question 27) that it depended on IEPs. In contrast, special education administrators gave approximately the same number of responses to "high school graduation,"

"depends on IEPs", "same as other students", and "course credit completion."

To evaluate current achievement (Question 28), special education administrators gave 5 different answers with the most frequent being "progress reports," and general education administrators gave three different responses, with the most frequent being "IEP evaluation." "Progress reporting" was one of the most frequent answers for both types of administrators to Question 29 "What systems does you school use to monitor individual student progress and provide support to students who need it?" However, 4 of the 8 special education administrators mentioned grades, in contrast to zero general education administrators who made this response.

When asked "How do you currently evaluate the outcomes of your school's special education program?" (Question 30), the most frequent response for both types of administrators was "We don't." And yet, when asked "Are there consequences/sanctions you or your could school face if students fail to meet state standards?" (Question 31), the most common response for both types of administrators was that the administrator would be fired/removed/transferred.

Technology

With regard to many of the technology-related questions, the typical responses tended to be that students use the typical computers with typical software. This was the response of almost all of the special education administrators to Question 32a "What instructional technology does your school use to enhance the success of at-risk students in standard general education courses?" Two-thirds of the general education administrators gave this answer. When the question was changed to focus on students with disabilities (Question 32b), again two-thirds of the general education administrators gave the same answer, but five of eight special education administrators said that it depended on the student's IEP.

When asked about adaptive technology to enhance the success of at-risk students (Question 33a) and students with disabilities (Question 33b) in standard general education courses, the typical response was not much or not at all. Most general education administrators (7of 8 responses) gave the same answer to Question 34 "What staff development activities has the staff of this school engaged in to learn about instructional and adaptive technology?" Special education administrators mentioned inservice or district classes (6 of 7 responses).

Discussion

Many of the findings give the impression that general education and special education administrators are not "on the same page." Part of the problem involves a lack of the basic components of good programming. For example, most administrators said that they had no formal vision or policy statement for including students with disabilities in general education classes. Most special education administrators stated that their high school's orientation was college preparation, and yet the general education administrators in the same schools said that the orientation involved multiple paths. With confusion on points like these, it is not surprising

that there is so little overlaps in the description of challenges to at-risk students and students with disabilities with regard to being successful in standard general education classes.

Similar discrepancies were shown in the program section of the survey. On every question involving students with disabilities, there seems to be a significant discrepancy between what general and special education administrators said. Special education administrators had little information about the school budget and viewed the components of a successful program and working with parents in a very different way than general education administrators.

Although staff development was often mentioned as a need, approximately half of each administrator group stated that there had been little or no staff development that focused on improving the performance of students with disabilities in general education classrooms. Again, there was a wide disparity both within and between the two groups about how staff development should be selected and what needed to be the topics of instruction. In particular, there was almost no overlap in responses to the question "How would you like to change your current staff development system?"

With regard to planning, administrators were able to define standards-based instruction, but they did not seem to know how to apply this process to at-risk students and students with disabilities. Most general education administrators thought that standards-based teaching had no influence on teaching students with disabilities. Although there were various indicators of dissatisfaction with the current planning process, the most common mechanism that was mentioned was the daily planning period.

There was little in the way of systematic program evaluation mentioned by either type of administrator. Although there was a concern that there was a potential problem with students not meeting standards, this concern has not resulted in any extensive type of program evaluation, especially in regard to students who are in general education classrooms.

As far as technology is concerned, administrators rely on existing standard computers with standard software. Very few examples (e.g., a student who needs adaptive technology because of a vision problem) were given.

The generality of this survey are limited because it only involved the administrators associated with nine schools. Now that this survey has been conducted, there are possible modifications that could be made to the questions themselves and the interview process. However, what is surprising is the consistency of responses across the 9 schools in 4 states in rural, suburban, and urban settings.

To conclude, the results of this survey indicate a lack of coordination between general and special education administrators. Additionally, there seems to be a lack of focused direction in terms of educating students with disabilities and other at-risk students. They seem to be seeing many issues in very different ways and do not seem to have a comprehensive plan for these

students. Without a singular direction, they might be working at cross purposes and thus weakening the services to at-risk students and students with disabilities.

References

Arick, J. R., & Krug, D. A. (1993). Special education administrators in the United States: Perceptions on policy and personnel issues. *Journal of Special Education, 27*, 348-64.

Coleman, M. R. (2000). *Bright futures for exceptional learners: Technical Report. Conditions for special education teaching*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Erickson, R., Ysseldyke, J., Thurlow, M., & Elliott, J. (1998). Inclusive assessments and accountability systems: Tools of the trade in educational reform. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 31 (2),* 4-9.

Kameenui, E. J., & Carnine, D. W. (1998). *Effective teaching strategies that accommodate diverse learners.* Des Moines: Prentice-Hall.

Morgan,C. R.; & Demchak, M. A. (1998). Involving building administrators in planning for inclusive educational programs. *Rural Educator; 20(2),* 26-30.

Schumaker, J. B. (1992). Social performance of individuals with learning disabilities: Through the looking glass of KU-IRLD Research. *School Psychology Review, 21*, 387-399.

Sullivan, M. E. (1996). Identifying challenges to rural education: Role clarification for administrators In D. Montgomery (ed.), *Rural goals 2000: Building programs that work.* Baltimore: American Council on Rural Special Education.

Turnbull, H. R, III & Turnbull, A. P. (1998). *Free appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities. (5th ed.)* Denver, CO: Love.

Wagner, M., Blackorby, J. & Hebbeler, K. (1993). *Beyond the report card: The multiple dimensions of secondary school performance of students with disabilities. A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Appendix A
A Comparison of Responses between General Education and Special Education Teachers

Organization and Curriculum

1a. Does your school have a general mission statement? If so, what is it?

Sped Admin 9 responses	GenEd Admin 8 responses	Responses
2	1	Become life-long learners
3	4	Commitment to education and life
1	1	Prepared to meet college entrance requirements
1	0	Provide opportunities in a safe secure atmosphere
2	2	But unsure of wording

1b. Does your school have a formal vision statement or policy statement for inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classes?

Sped Admin 7 responses	GenEd Admin 7 responses	Responses
3	2	Yes
4	5	No

2. What academic paths are offered within your general curriculum?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 8 responses	Responses
6	1	College prep
2	7	Multiple paths

3. What is your school's procedure for assigning students with disabilities to general education classes?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 8 responses	Responses
3	7	Within the IEP process
3	0	Place students in general education courses as much as possible
2	1	Computer-generated process based on graduation or achievement information

4a. Describe the top three challenges your staff faces in assisting students who are at-risk to succeed in the standard general curriculum. (The total number below is higher because each participant should have provided 3 challenges.)

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
4 responses	6 responses	
1	0	Students meeting standards
1	2	Staff training
2	0	Behavior problems
1	1	Motivating students that high school is important
1	0	Parents do not value education
1	0	Find interesting classes
1	0	More general education offerings
1	0	Lack of organization
1	1	Academic deficits
1	1	Reading problems
1	0	Connecting with mental health services
1	0	Adapted curricula
1	2	Lack of time
1	0	Expressing classroom expectations
0	1	Attendance
0	1	Staff collaboration
0	1	Veteran teachers coaching new teachers
0	1	Students overwhelmed with so many problems
0	1	Large class sizes
0	1	Available interventions
0	1	Connecting with parents
0	1	Meet individual needs
0	1	Understand changing needs
0	1	School size

4b. Describe the top three challenges your staff faces in assisting students with disabilities to succeed in the standard general curriculum. (The total number below is higher because each participant should have provided 3 challenges.)

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
4 responses	6 responses	
1	0	Students meeting standard
3	3	Teacher training
2	0	Behavior problems
1	0	Motivating students that high school is important
1	0	Find interesting classes
0	3	Reading problems
1	0	Connecting with mental health services

1	0	Adapted curricula
2	1	Lack of time
1	0	Expressing classroom expectations
0	1	Attendance
0	2	Staff collaboration
0	1	Veteran teachers coaching new teachers
0	2	Large class sizes
0	1	Meet individual needs
0	1	Understand changing needs
0	1	School size
1	0	General education teachers don't want to work with special education students
1	0	Knowing how the special education mind works
1	0	Lack of space
1	0	Lack of privacy
1	0	Understanding assignments
1	0	Fulfilling accommodations/modifications IEP requirements
1	0	Communicating with IEP team
0	1	Stigma while in general education classrooms
0	1	Agreement about curricula
0	1	Staff realizing that special education students have the ability to learn
0	1	Knowledge of students' disabilities
0	1	Lack of resources

5a. Does your school have a school-wide discipline plan? If so, what is it?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	8 responses	
3	2	Yes, based on district policy
4	4	Yes, in student handbook or school-based program
1	2	No

5b. Is the discipline plan effective?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	8 responses	
5	5	Yes
2	2	Somewhat
1	1	No

6a. What changes in your school would you like to see happen to further ensure the success of students who are at-risk in standard general education classes?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	8 responses	
4	3	Staff development
4	5	Programming changes

6b. What changes in your school would you like to see happen to further ensure the success of students with disabilities in standard general education classes?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	7 responses	
3	2	Staff development
5	5	Programming changes

7. Do you see these two groups of students as being different in their needs?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	8 responses	
4	4	Similar
4	4	Different

8a. What percentage of your time is taken for supervising/coordinating and evaluating instructional programs for at-risk students?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	8 responses	
3	0	0%
3	4	1-10%
2	4	20-35%

8b. What percentage of your time is taken for supervising/coordinating and evaluating instructional programs for students with disabilities?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	7 responses	
0	1	0%
3	4	3-10%
2	2	20-35%
3	0	90-100%

Programs

9. How do you integrate dollars from multiple programs at your school to ensure the success of students with disabilities in rigorous general education classes?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	8 responses	
1	4	Through various ways
2	2	Not integrated
1	2	Not sure
3	0	Don't know

10a. What programs does your school currently have in place to ensure the success of students who are at-risk who are enrolled in rigorous general education classes (those required for a standard diploma)?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	8 responses	
6	5	Special programs
1	2	Extra specialized staff
0	1	They aren't in rigorous general education classes
1	0	Don't know

10b What programs does your school currently have in place to ensure the success of students with disabilities who are enrolled in rigorous general education classes (those required for a standard diploma)?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	7 responses	
6	2	Special programs
1	1	Special staff
0	2	Meetings
0	1	They aren't in rigorous general education classes
0	1	None

10c. Do you have extended learning time?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	6 responses	
6	5	Yes
1	0	Sometimes
0	1	No

11. What components within those programs are most effective in promoting students' success?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 8 responses	Responses
2	1	Individualized attention
2	5	Caring teachers
1	0	Lower class size
1	0	After school library assistance
2	0	Special classes
0	1	Teacher support
0	1	General education-Special education teacher teamwork

12. How does your school involve parents in helping students learn academic skills?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 8 responses	Responses
6	3	Regular, ongoing teacher contact
1	2	Parent support/site group
1	1	IEP team process
0	1	Quarterly contact
0	1	Haven't had parent involvement

Staff Development

13a. How is staff development planned and implemented in your school/district?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 7 responses	Responses
3	4	Teacher recommendations
3	0	District-level staff development offerings
1	0	Curriculum coordinator
1	0	School and district-level decision
0	1	Administrator recommendation
	1	Random selection
0	1	None

13b. How is staff development intentionally focused on improving the performance of at-risk students in rigorous general education classes?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
5 responses	6 responses	
3	1	None or not much
1	2	Inservice or workshops
1	2	Consultant or specialist assistance
0	1	Special education teachers created materials for general education teachers

14. How is staff development intentionally focused on improving the performance of students with disabilities in rigorous general education classes?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	7 responses	
4	3	None or not much
2	2	Inservice or workshops
1	0	Consultant or specialist assistance
0	1	Special education teachers created materials for general education teachers
1	1	District/school analysis of state standards

15. What staff development activities in your school have been aimed at helping at-risk students meets state standards?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
5 responses	7 responses	
1	3	None
1	1	Special education teachers did workshop for general education teachers
1	0	Workshop on new curriculum
0	2	Workshop on state test
0	1	Workshop on legal obligations
1	0	Compliance review
1	0	Special education cooperative review

16. What staff development activities in your school have been aimed at helping special education students meet state standards?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 7 responses	Responses
4	3	None
2	2	Inservice
1	0	Consultant assistance
1	1	Analysis of state standards
0	1	Special education teachers working with general education teachers

17. What staff development training methods or models are used in this schools which promote positive outcomes in staff learning and positive changes in staff instructional behavior? (This question was interpreted in several different ways.)

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 7 responses	Responses
1	1	Special education teachers training general education teachers
4	1	None
1	0	An internal focus group
1	0	A constructionist model
1	0	Training by occupational therapist
0	1	Cognitive coaching
0	1	6th street writing program
0	1	Results-based development model
0	1	Thinking map
0	1	Peer coaching

18. How would you like to change your current staff-development system?

Sped Admin 9 responses	GenEd Admin 6 responses	Responses
3	1	More staff development time
2	0	Less staff development time
1	0	Meet with all teachers together
1	0	A special education overview
1	0	Peer tutoring
1	0	Create staff development system
0	3	Make staff development more individualized
0	1	Data-based planning
0	1	More focus on school problems

19a. In the last two years, how many staff development sessions have you focused on at-risk students?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
6 responses	5 responses	
4	2	0
1	3	1-5
1	0	6-10

19b. In the last two years, how many staff development sessions have you focused on students with disabilities?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	5 responses	
5	3	0
2	2	1-5
1	0	6-10

Planning for Instruction

20a. What is your definition of standards-based instruction?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	8 responses	
5	4	Identified critical skills
2	3	Match instruction to benchmarks
0	1	Make sure that teachers are teaching the same thing
1	0	Don't know

20b. What advantages do you see in standards-based teaching?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
9 responses	7 responses	
1	0	Higher expectations
4	2	Consistency
3	4	Teachers know what to teach
1	0	Tell is students have mastered skills
0	1	More options after standards are met

20c. What disadvantages do you see in standards-based teaching?

Sped Admin 7 responses	GenEd Admin 7 responses	Responses
2	2	Lack of creativity
1	0	Lack of staff development
1	0	More paperwork
1	0	Doesn't allow for individualized needs
2	0	Leaves out special education students
0	1	Only teaches the standards
0	1	None
0	2	Lacks flexibility
0	1	Need national standards

20d. What barriers do you see in standards-based teaching?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 8 responses	Responses
2	0	Lack of staff development
2	1	Teacher resistance
2	0	Lack of time and resources
1	1	Lack of flexibility
1	0	Inconsistency across states
0	1	Reduces teacher creativity
0	1	Disagreement about standards
0	2	Everyone understanding and using the same standards
0	1	Goes against social promotion
0	1	Ignorance of the need for standards

21a. How are state standards used in your school for curriculum?

Sped Admin 6 responses	GenEd Admin 8 responses	Responses
6	7	Alignment curriculum to standards
0	1	Don't know

21b. *How are state standards used in your school for instruction?*

Sped Admin 3 responses	GenEd Admin 6 responses	Responses
1	5	Teaching to meet state standards
1	0	Teachers are changing instruction to meet state standards
1	0	Guides teacher actions
0	1	Don't know

21c. How are state standards used in your school for assessment?

Sped Admin 3 responses	GenEd Admin 7 responses	Responses
3	3	Teachers are using similar test format to state assessment
0	2	Teachers are beginning to reformat the assessment process
0	2	Don't know

21d. How are state standards used in your school for teacher evaluation?

Sped Admin 6 responses	GenEd Admin 7 responses	Responses
3	3	They aren't
2	4	Use of state standards are part of teacher evaluations
1	0	A part of teacher evaluation if state standards knowledge is an issue

22a. How does standards-based teaching influence the education for at-risk students who are enrolled in standard general education classes?

Sped Admin 5 responses	GenEd Admin 9 responses	Responses
1	0	More referrals for special education services
1	0	It targets key content
2	0	Raises expectations
1	2	Makes them depressed because they fail
0	1	Keeps teachers on track
0	1	Need to find many ways to reach them
0	3	No difference
0	1	We don't support them

22b. Other than time, what are the barriers to helping at-risk students meet state standards?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	5 responses	
1	0	Larger class size
1	0	Staff training
2	2	Attendance
1	0	Lack motivation
1	0	Lack prerequisite skills
1	1	Lack money
0	1	Developing accommodations
0	1	Convince at-risk students that education is important

22c. How are at-risk students enrolled in standard general education courses educated differently than other general education students?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
9 responses	9 responses	
6	4	They aren't
2	1	They get extra help/programs
1	1	They require more effort
0	1	There are lower expectations
0	1	Depends on the teacher
0	1	Pick teachers more closely

23a. How does standards-based teaching influence the education for students with disabilities who are enrolled in standard general education classes?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
4 responses	5 responses	
1	0	It is tough to give support
1	1	IEP goals must meet standards
1	0	Focuses on skills
1	3	It doesn't
0	1	They require extra help

23b. Other than time, what are the barriers to helping students with disabilities meet state standards?

Sped Admin 8 responses	GenEd Admin 6 responses	Responses
1	0	Need more staff
3	1	Need trained staff
1	0	Need alternative test
1	0	Need resources
1	0	Lack staff
1	0	The testing process
0	1	Money
0	3	Lack of time meeting standards
0	1	Students need to realize that it is important

23c. How should students with disabilities enrolled in standard general education courses be educated differently than other students who are at risk?

Sped Admin 9 responses	GenEd Admin 9 responses	Responses
3	2	Depends on IEP
1	0	Gives students more time
1	1	Need accommodations and adaptations
4	3	Shouldn't make a difference
0	2	Needs more individualized attention
0	1	Lower expectations

24. What structures are in place in your school to allow general education teachers time to plan their instruction to align with state standards?

Sped Admin 6 responses	GenEd Admin 9 responses	Responses
4	4	Regular planning time during the day
1	2	Release time for staff development
0	2	Teacher planning days
0	1	Pay teachers to rework curriculum
1	0	Limited efforts

25. What structures are in place in your school to allow special education and general education teachers time to plan instruction together?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
6 responses	8 responses	
3	4	Regular planning time
1	1	Release time
1	0	Substitute teachers are hired so that the special ed and general ed teachers can meet
1	0	Regular department meetings
0	1	Administrator in charge of planning
0	1	Beginning of year meetings
0	1	We don't

Program Evaluation

26. What methods or procedures are used to evaluate education programs in your school?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
9 responses	7 responses	
1	0	Aren't any
1	1	5-7 year plan is evaluated
1	0	Teacher survey
2	0	Statewide assessment results
1	2	Yearly reports
1	0	Accreditation standards
2	0	Don't know
0	1	On-going measures
0	1	Attendance and academic data after the fact
0	1	District and school surveys
0	1	Class dropout rate and parent complaints

27. What are the outcomes for students with disabilities who are enrolled in standard general education courses?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
9 responses	6 responses	
2	1	High school graduation
2	4	Depends on IEP
2	0	Same as other students
3	0	Course credit completion
0	1	None

28. How do you currently evaluate the achievement of those outcomes?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
9 responses	6 responses	
2	1	Graduation credits
1	3	IEP evaluation
2	0	Student grades
1	0	Work samples
3	0	Progress reports
0	2	We don't

29. What systems does you school use to monitor individual student progress and provide support to students who need it?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	7 responses	
1	1	IEP tracking
3	4	Progress reporting
4	0	Grades
0	2	Use of student support teams

30. How do you currently evaluate the outcomes of your school's special education program?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	8 responses	
2	0	ESD evaluation
2	1	IEP compliance review
3	3	We don't
0	1	Graduation rate
0	1	School improvement plan
0	1	Academic progress
0	1	State evaluation system

31. Are there consequences/sanctions could you or your school face if students fail to meet state standards?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	7 responses	
2	1	Aren't any
3	4	Administrator fired/removed/transferred
2	2	School goes on probation/accreditation

Technology

32a. What instructional technology does your school use to enhance the success of at-risk students in standard general education courses?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	9 responses	
6	6	Computers with general software (e.g., word processing)
1	3	Special software

32b. What instructional technology does your school use to enhance the success of students with disabilities in standard general education courses?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	9 responses	
5	3	Based on IEP
3	6	Nothing special

33a. What adaptive technology does your school use to enhance the success of at-risk students in standard general education courses?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	9 responses	
8	8	Nothing special
0	1	For only one student

33b. What adaptive technology does your school use to enhance the success of students with disabilities in standard general education courses?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
8 responses	9 responses	
3	0	Depends on IEP
1	1	Special software
4	8	None or not much

34. What staff development activities has the staff of this school engaged in to learn about instructional and adaptive technology?

Sped Admin	GenEd Admin	Responses
7 responses	8 responses	
4	1	Inservice
2	0	District classes
1	7	None or not much

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
X	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").